

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/723,615	CHENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lan Nguyen	3683	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lan Nguyen. (3)_____.
- (2) Tom Harverstock. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 22 April 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,143 and 145-148.

Identification of prior art discussed: Massa.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner informs Mr. Haverstock of the Advisory Action and further explaining that Massa does not disclose of an air cushion between elements 1 and 2. In fact, elements 1 and 2 of Massa are always in contact because of the central groove as illustrated in figure 2. Hence, the amended claim 1 does not overcome Massa. Newly submitted claims 145-148 and amended claim 143 are directed towards non-elected embodiments. .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required